

MALIGNING PRO-LIFERS

The following article was written by the Catholic League's communications director Michael P. McDonald:

The National Abortion Federation's (NAF) "2020 Violence and Disruption Statistics" report has a dearth of information to support any of its claims. But what NAF lacks in facts, it makes up for it in hyperbole, innuendo, and hypocrisy designed to portray pro-life activists, many of whom are Catholic, in the most negative light possible.

On the first full page of the report, NAF lists the first major instance of "violence" by pro-life advocates to be "anti-abortion protesters congregated outside abortion clinics." The problem with calling this "violence" is that this is totally legal. It is true that the Freedom of Access to Clinic Entrances Act creates a bubble around abortion clinics where pro-life advocates cannot demonstrate; however, as long as they stay outside of the bubble, pro-lifers can congregate to their hearts content.

What is not legal are the pro-abortion advocates protesting outside of the homes of Supreme Court justices. 18 US Code Section 1507 clearly states, "Whoever...with the intent of influencing any judge...in the discharge of his duty, pickets or parades...in or near a building or residence occupied or used by such judge...or resorts to any other demonstration in or near any such building or residence, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than one year, or both." The pro-abortion advocates clearly violate this statute making their congregating an illegal act.

NAF should know all of these rules, but it would rather make a scurrilous and hypocritical claim to portray pro-lifers as the wrong-doers.

In addition to "congregating," NAF points out that many of

these pro-life advocates failed to observe “stay-at-home orders and public health guidance to avoid group gatherings.” But when Black Lives Matter (BLM) and Antifa took to the streets in 2020, failing to observe stay-at-home orders, over a thousand doctors declared these actions justified because “white supremacy is a lethal public health issue....”

Even government officials, tasked with enforcing stay-at-home orders, cheered them on. Former New York Mayor Bill de Blasio, for instance, decreed, “We’re in the middle of a national crisis.” Of course, he was referencing systemic racism and used this logic to justify easing COVID-19 restrictions for BLM and Antifa.

NAF also asserts that many of the congregators were “white supremacist individuals.” Yet it provided no evidence to prove this. How did it know these people were white supremacists? Did everyone outside have a swastika tattooed on his forehead? Without any evidence to back up this claim, NAF just grabbed the current buzzword the Left has adopted to attack people that do not agree with its policies.

Another act of violence NAF highlights is “protestors co-opting language of the movement for Black lives in their attempts to intimidate providers and patients.” This is a preposterous claim. Just because BLM uses certain words does not forbid anyone from using similar slogans. Further, employing copy-cat language for a peaceful demonstration does not constitute violence.

After making these arguments, NAF attempts to appeal to authority in an effort to add a veneer of credibility. Citing a January 2020 unclassified report from the FBI, NAF declares that “there is an ongoing increase in anti-abortion threats, disruptions, and violence.” Setting aside the over-politicized nature of the FBI, there is a serious flaw citing this bulletin. If one reads the first bullet from the FBI, the Bureau uses information provided by NAF. They are quoting

themselves as a source.

Finally, NAF attempts to present data to support its several pages of innuendo that pro-life activists represent a clear and present danger. But even in this section, the facts are weak.

They claim that their “members report an increase in assault and battery outside of clinics with the majority of incidents involving anti-abortion protestors having altercations...[including] shoving, pushing, tripping, and spitting on clinic escorts, staff, and others outside of clinics.”

While no one should engage in such actions, a little perspective is required. The BLM and Antifa riots in 2020 caused over two billion dollars in property damage according to insurance payouts. They also left at least 25 people dead. Pushing, shoving and tripping are not even in the same league as BLM and Antifa.

In addition to “pushing” and “shoving,” NAF claims that there were 115,517 instances of picketing. However, the “picketing” NAF describes is not similar to a wildcat strike with disgruntled laborers physically attacking scabs for trying to get to work. Starting in 2011, NAF’s own statistics make a distinction between people obstructing the entrance to a clinic and people picketing, which is to say peacefully protesting. In other words, pro-life advocates exercising their constitutionally protected right to assemble is what NAF considers violence.

Ultimately, no one should consider “2020 Violence and Disruption Statistics” a serious report. Rather than using facts and data to support their claims, NAF does everything it can to make pro-lifers look like violent extremists. No, if one really wants to see genuine abortion-related violence, they would do well to look at the pro-abortion camp,

particularly Antifa-affiliated Jane's Revenge or Ruth Sent Us.

GARLAND ASKED TO MOVE ON JANE'S REVENGE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue sent the following letter to U.S. Attorney General Merrick Garland today:

June 17, 2022

The Honorable Merrick Garland
Attorney General
U.S. Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, D.C. 20530-0001

Dear Attorney General Garland:

As president of the nation's largest Catholic civil rights organization, I am requesting that you immediately deploy the full resources of the Department of Justice to apprehend and prosecute domestic terrorists who have recently attacked Catholic individuals, vandalized Catholic churches and torched Catholic-operated crisis pregnancy centers.

We have witnessed a rash of vandalism against Catholic churches, firebombings of crisis pregnancy centers (many of which are run by Catholics), Masses being interrupted, illegal protests outside the homes of Catholic Supreme Court Justices, and an attempted murder of one of the Catholic Justices. While there are several groups involved in these attacks, none is more dangerous than Jane's Revenge.

Jane's Revenge is a domestic terrorist group, par excellence.

Recently formed, it brags about blowing up crisis pregnancy centers. Worse, it is calling for a "Night of Rage" on the day the Supreme Court is expected to overturn *Roe v. Wade*.

Jane's Revenge made its first public statement on May 8, following the firebombing of a crisis pregnancy center in Madison, Wisconsin. It demanded that these facilities be shut down, pledging to destroy them if they remained open. It ended by saying, "We are not one group, but many. We are in your city. We are in every city."

It was on May 30 when it issued its "Night of Rage" threat. "On the night the final ruling is issued," it said, "we are asking for courageous hearts to come out after dark." It said it had chosen "a time of 8pm for actions nationwide to begin, but know that this is just a general guideline."

On June 14, Jane's Revenge issued another online post, citing operations in 16 cities, as well as in "countless locations invisibly." Saying that "it's open season" on "anti-choice" groups, it pledged to "never stop, back down, slow down, or retreat." It sent a message to pro-life entities saying, "Eventually your insurance companies, and your financial backers will realize you are a bad investment."

On June 16, it said it would continue to destroy crisis pregnancy centers like the one in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area.

Reportedly, the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives is investigating Jane's Revenge. The Department of Homeland Security's National Terrorism Advisory issued a statement on June 7 saying, "The United States remains in a heightened threat environment," noting that "faith-based institutions" are among those being targeted.

On June 16, the FBI admitted that it is investigating these attacks on pro-life and faith-based institutions, though it did not say which groups it is probing. Assumedly, Jane's

Revenge is at the top of its list.

We have learned, from credible sources, that there is a link between Jane's Revenge and Antifa, the far-left anarchist group. Their modus operandi and goals are very similar. Together, these two loosely organized terrorist groups pose a grave threat to democracy.

Sixteen senators wrote to you on June 7 asking for information on what the Justice Department is doing about these attacks. I applaud them for their interest, but we are beyond the point where data gathering is sufficient. We have now reached the stage where probes are academic. The clock is ticking.

We need aggressive action against those who have not only taken credit for violence across the nation—they are pledging to engage in more of it. Jane's Revenge fits the bill in both instances. The "Night of Rage" that it is threatening must never be allowed to commence.

Please take immediate action to see to it that these threats never materialize.

Sincerely,

William A. Donohue, Ph.D.

President

Contact Kristen Clarke, Assistant AG: kristen.clarke@usdoj.gov

CATHOLIC COLORADO LAWMAKERS

DEFY BISHOPS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Catholic politicians in Colorado who reject the Church's teaching on abortion:

Separation of church and state cuts both ways, but few in the media have any interest in reporting on this when it is the state that is crossing the line. That's what is happening in Colorado.

In March, Democratic Colorado lawmakers passed a bill that explicitly rejects the humanity of unborn children; it was signed into law in April by Democratic Gov. Jared Polis. Not unexpectedly, Catholic bishops denounced the legislation.

In a letter signed last week by Denver Archbishop Samuel Aquila, Jorge Rodriguez, Auxiliary Bishop of Denver, Pueblo Bishop Stephen Berg and Colorado Springs Bishop James Golka, they said it is "a gravely sinful action because it facilitates the killing of innocent unborn babies, and those Catholic politicians who have done so have very likely placed themselves outside the communion of the church."

The letter made it clear that these politicians are "encouraging others to do evil," thus giving scandal to the Church. As such, until they seek repentance in confession, they should "voluntarily refrain from receiving communion."

The bishops did their job and did so without drama. The drama came from some Catholic lawmakers who are now telling the bishops they are wrong. Rep. David Ortiz, for example, said the bishops were not "stewarding people's souls" and were guilty of "confusing spirituality and politics."

Ortiz could not be more wrong. In fact, the bishops are charged with upholding Catholic teachings on public policy issues (abortion being one of them) and are expected to follow

canon law prescriptions regarding Catholic politicians who are in open defiance of those teachings. They are not the ones who are politicizing this issue—it is those who are publicly challenging them. That they are agents of the state makes their stance even more serious.

Rep. Monica Duran, another pro-abortion Catholic critic of the bishops, accused the bishops of “sending the wrong message” to Catholics. She has it backwards. By standing their ground, the bishops are sending the right message to practicing Catholics: they are saying to them that fidelity to the Church’s teaching on abortion is expected by those who publicly claim to be part of the Catholic community.

Brittany Vessely, executive director of the Colorado Catholic Conference, defended the bishops, noting that abortion “violates a fundamental moral teaching of the Church in its complete desecration of life and the millions of children who are killed annually.”

Every organization, including secular ones, has tenets that those who belong to it are expected to follow. If some find it too burdensome to do so, they know where the exit door is. It is the height of audacity when those who reject strictures they voluntarily embraced to claim victim status when they are called out for doing so.

Kudos to the Colorado bishops and the Colorado Catholic Conference.

Let Denver Archbishop Aquila know of your appreciation for what he and the other Colorado bishops are doing.

Contact Kevin Greany, the archbishop’s director of communications: kevin.greany@archden.org

BIDEN IS PROMOTING CHILD ABUSE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on President Biden's latest policy on transgender youth:

For the first time in American history, we have a president who is championing the cause of child abuse. On June 15, the White House released a [statement](#) saying President Biden is issuing an executive order seeking to ban "conversion therapy," the practice that allows someone who has "transitioned" to the opposite sex to reverse the process. He is putting the Department of Health and Human Services in charge of his policy.

In classic Orwellian doublespeak, the White House is saying Biden is taking multiple actions to "protect children across America," falsely claiming that children who undergo "conversion therapy" face "higher rates of attempted suicide and trauma." The facts are otherwise.

Six Swedish scientists studied those who had "transitioned" to the opposite sex and the findings were not auspicious. Their paper, "Long-Term Follow-Up of Transsexual Persons Undergoing Sex Reassignment Surgery: Cohort Study in Sweden," found that in the course of 30 years, from 1973 to 2003, those who had "transitioned" had "considerably higher risks for mortality, suicidal behaviour, and psychiatric morbidity than the general population."

A British study done by Birmingham University's Aggressive Research Intelligence Facility, examined more than 100 studies on post-operative transgender persons and found that "none of these studies provides conclusive evidence that gender

reassignment is beneficial for patients.”

What Biden is doing is worse. He said when he was running for president that he supports eight-year-olds who want to change their sex. Those are third graders. Yet if they were left alone, most would conclude that they do not want to switch their sex. Studies from Vanderbilt University and London’s Portman Clinic found that 70-80 percent of children who had expressed an interest in changing their sex ultimately decided not to do so.

The data on suicide are just as persuasive in undermining what Biden is saying.

The suicide rate among those who undergo surgery to change their sex is 20 times higher than those who do not. Another study found that minors who “transition” to the opposite sex without parental consent are associated with “higher risk of suicide.” Furthermore, a study in the American Journal of Preventive Medicine found that 80 percent of gender minority students report having mental health problems, nearly double that of normal children.

There needs to be a national moratorium on the pernicious practice of allowing children to switch their nature-assigned sex.

Biden is spinning out of control in many areas, but his pathological obsession with encouraging little kids, who obviously have mental issues, to switch their sex (which technically cannot be done anyway) is simply off-the-charts.

Adults who counsel children to consider changing their sex, or otherwise facilitate sex-reassignment surgery—complete with hormone blockers and genital mutilation—are a threat to their psychological and physiological well-being. This is child abuse. Astonishingly, President Biden is leading the way.

Contact the White House Press Secretary: [Karine Jean-](#)

BIDEN AND PELOSI SILENT ON ANTI-CATHOLICISM

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the way President Biden and Rep. Pelosi have addressed bigotry:

President Joe Biden and House Speaker Nancy Pelosi are both self-described “devout Catholics.” Given the [rash of attacks](#) on Catholics and Catholic Churches, it would be reasonable to expect that they would condemn these acts of anti-Catholicism. Yet neither has said a word.

It is not as though they are indifferent to bigotry—they are quick to pounce on prejudice and discrimination when non-Catholics are targeted. Here are some comments they made either this year or last year:

Biden

- Asians: “The Federal Government should combat racism, xenophobia, and intolerance against Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders and should work to ensure that all members of AAPI communities—no matter their background, the language they speak, or their religious beliefs—are treated with dignity and equity.”
- Blacks: “In my campaign for President, I made it very clear that the moment had arrived as a nation where we face deep racial inequities in America and system—systemic racism that has plagued our nation for far, far too long.”

- Jews: "In the last weeks, our nation has seen a series of anti-Semitic attacks, targeting and terrorizing American Jews...These attacks are despicable, unconscionable, un-American, and they must stop."
- Transgender Persons: "My entire Administration is committed to ensuring that transgender people enjoy the freedom and equality that are promised to everyone in America...To transgender Americans of all ages, I want you to know that you are so brave. You belong. I have your back."

Pelosi

- Asians: "While Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders have long been the targets of racism and xenophobia, the pandemic has fueled a heartbreaking wave of hateful speech and violent attacks against these communities...let us always stand with our AAPI friends, family and neighbors..."

Blacks: "As we remember with open eyes the injustices of the past, we also recognize the inequities of the present: from the scourges of systemic racism and police violence to the plights of economic inequality and health disparity, which have been exacerbated by the pandemic."

Jews: "Antisemitism cannot be tolerated."

Latinos: "As vile, xenophobic rhetoric continues to target Latino communities across the country, House Democrats remain committed to embracing America's beautiful diversity and building a more just future."

Muslims: "Racism and bigotry of any form, including Islamophobia, must always be called out, confronted and condemned in any place it is found."

Transgender People: "This year in particular, our transgender neighbors and loved ones have endured a heartbreaking and accelerating campaign of violence and persecution..."

We could not find a single instance when either Biden or Pelosi condemned anti-Catholicism, despite the fact that they have been in government for a combined total of 85 years.

Even when Supreme Court nominee Amy Coney Barrett was subjected to blatant anti-Catholic attacks by Sen. Dianne Feinstein—"the dogma lives loudly within you"—neither Biden or Pelosi complained. The best they could do was to say that her faith should not matter.

How to explain their silence, especially in light of their extremely strong denunciations of bigotry against other demographic groups? That's not as hard to figure out as some may think. Consider what has been happening lately.

The recent rash of vandalism against Catholic churches, firebombings of crisis pregnancy centers, Masses being interrupted, illegal protests outside the homes of Catholic Supreme Court Justices, coupled with an assassination plot against one of them—these are all the acts of pro-abortion zealots.

Neither Biden nor Pelosi has done anything, or said anything, to stop or condemn these despicable acts of anti-Catholicism. Catholics would merit a better response from fair-minded agnostics than they are receiving from these two pro-abortion zealots. Looks like they checked their "devout Catholic" status at the church door.

Contact White House Press Secretary Karine Jean-Pierre:
Karine.Jean-Pierre@who.eop.gov

Contact Pelosi's chief of staff:
terri.mccullough@mail.house.gov

ANTI-CATHOLIC SPAWNS VIOLENCE

INVECTIVE

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the Catholic churches being vandalized:

The recent spate of Catholic churches that have been [vandalized](#), as well as the bombing of pro-life crisis pregnancy centers (many of which are run by Catholics), are not a coincidence. Nor is the attempted murder of Brett Kavanaugh, the Catholic Supreme Court Justice. They reflect a deep-seated animus against the right of orthodox Catholics to participate in public life.

When Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg was on the high court, she was joined by Stephen Breyer and Elena Kagan. All three are Jewish. No one complained, nor should they have, about the fact that Jews are roughly 2 percent of the population yet they made up a third of the Supreme Court. But when Catholics are overrepresented—six of the Justices are Catholic (they are a little less than a quarter of the population)—that's a different story.

Those who have spoken critically about the number of Catholics on the Supreme Court include some notable activists and pundits.

- Americans United for Separation of Church and State president Rachel Laser saw the draft opinion on *Roe v. Wade* authored by Catholic Justice Samuel Alito as something nefarious. "They attempt to impose one religious viewpoint on all of us," she said. Referring to the Catholics on the bench as "religious extremists," she accused them of trying "to destroy our democracy and force all of us to live by their narrow beliefs."
- Ron Grossman of the Chicago Tribune sounded the alarms

by noting that “if canon law becomes U.S. law, we will be perilously close to having a state religion.”

- Boston Globe columnist Joan Vennochi wrote that “The ultra-conservative bloc on the court includes Justice Neil Gorsuch and four of six Catholic justices.”
- New York Times columnist Maureen Dowd observes that “Catholic doctrine may be shaping (or misshaping) the freedom and the future of millions of women, and men. There is a corona of religious fervor around the court, a churchly ethos that threatens to turn our whole country upside down.”
- Jamie Manson, the head of the pro-abortion and anti-Catholic letterhead, Catholics for Choice, noted that there are “five radically anti-choice Catholics on this court.” She attributed this to a long campaign coordinated by “U.S. Catholic Bishops” and “very wealthy right-wing Catholics.”
- Eleanor Clift at the Daily Beast opined that we are “on the cusp of a decision that cements a theological view of abortion.”
- American Atheists said that Justice Alito’s ruling means that “White Christian Nationalism is a clear and existential threat.”
- Another atheist group, Freedom From Religion Foundation, says “Alito is one of six justices on the nine-member high court who are Roman Catholic,” noting that “Religion, as always, is at the heart of this attack against a fundamental right.”
- Frances Kissling, the former head of Catholics for Choice, complains that “the decision was, in essence, written by five Catholic lawyers who accept the most conservative version of Catholicism on abortion and who have applied it to secular American law.”
- In the Los Angeles Times, Sheila Briggs claims that “As the devastating effects on women’s lives become visible after the Supreme Court’s judgment, Catholics are going to feel increasing shame over what their church has

done.”

- Bette Midler came out of retirement to complain about all those Catholics on the high court. “Does that scream ‘diversity of opinion’ or ‘ability to be objective and fair’ to you given the historical #Roman Catholic antipathy to abortion?”

Ron Elving at NPR showed it is entirely possible to address the issue of abortion and Catholic judges without making anti-Catholic remarks. But he is unfortunately the exception to the rule.

These activists and pundits have helped to poison the public mind, suggesting that it is patently unfair to have so many Catholics on the high court. In essence, they want a religious test, which is constitutionally proscribed. Worse, they have driven a public narrative about Catholic judges that invites those who are already ill-disposed to Catholics to consider taking things into their own hands.

Catholic churches are being vandalized, crisis pregnancy centers are being bombed, illegal protests are taking place outside the homes of Catholic Supreme Court Justices, and one Catholic Justice was targeted by an assassin. Make no mistake, these are a direct consequence of this relentless spewing of anti-Catholic invective. It needs to stop.

PBS PROMOTING THE ANTI-POPE MYTH

Ronald J. Rychlak

Last week, Amna Nawaz of PBS interviewed David Kertzer, author

of a new book on Pope Pius XII and his dealings with the Nazis. We invited Ron Rychlak, Mississippi University law professor and member of the Catholic League's board of advisors, to respond to the interview. He is one of the nation's most prominent authorities on this subject.

The argument over Pope Pius XII and his leadership of the Catholic Church during World War II is once again in the news. This time it is driven by a book written by David Kertzer, a professor of anthropology and Italian studies at Brown University. The book is called *The Pope at War: The Secret History of Pius XII, Mussolini, and Hitler*.

Kertzer was one of the first researchers to explore newly opened archives from the papacy of Pius XII, and his book includes some interesting information. The author acknowledges that it [does not contain a single "smoking gun"](#), but that has not prevented headlines like this one from the *PBS News Hour*: "Vatican documents show secret back channel between Pope Pius XII and Adolph Hitler." In the associated interview, Kertzer says that his "most shocking finding" from the newly opened archives is that within weeks of Pius XII's 1939 coronation, Hitler sent Prince Phillip of Hesse to engage in negotiations with the Vatican.

Surprise, surprise, the pope negotiated with the prince. Of course he did! Some commentators have read this as evidence of a friendly relationship between Pius and the Nazi leader. It was no such thing. Pius understood that his Church and her mission were seriously threatened by the regime. He wanted to assure the safety of those people in his charge and the ability of the Church to continue saving souls.

Consider [Pope Francis's recent agreement](#) with the Communist Chinese government. It is not an endorsement of the Communist Chinese government; he wants to protect his Church and his people. Similarly, [his reluctance to condemn Putin](#) by name is not an approval of Russian aggression. It is recognition that

such words would not favorably impact Putin's behavior.

The negotiations about which Kertzer writes took place in 1939-41, before the final solution and the death camps. Pius did not know how Nazi persecution would evolve, and by maintaining relations with the German government, he hoped to push things in a favorable direction.

Kertzer says of the negotiations, "we didn't know about these until just now." That's not completely true. Italy's Foreign Minister, Count Ciano, made reference to the negotiations in his [wartime diary](#), and Jonathan Petropoulos analyzed them in his 2006 book, noting that "Polish clerics were already suffering tremendously at this time," and the pope might have hoped to improve the situation. This is a matter worthy of study, and thanks are due to Kertzer for finding more information, but the pre-publication articles and interviews are asserting matters well beyond what the evidence justifies. (And there is nary a mention of Pius XII's involvement in the efforts to assassinate Hitler.)

The other significant episode the PBS interview focuses on is the October 16, 1943, roundup of Roman Jews. This started with the Nazis demanding 50 kilograms of gold to assure that there would be no deportations. Fearing the worst, the Chief Rabbi of Rome approached the Vatican. Pope Pius XII agreed to an unlimited interest-free loan even though everyone knew that it could not be repaid anytime soon.

Unfortunately, the ransom merely bought a bit of time. As Kertzer explained, "On October 16, 1943, the S.S. had lists of all the Jews in Rome, and went door to door and tried to arrest all of Rome's Jews, thousands of them." They were successful in arresting about 1,260. According to Kertzer, "What we now learn from these recently opened archives is that the Vatican worked very hard to show that some of them had been baptized and therefore shouldn't be considered Jews..." Under Church teaching, anyone who was baptized as a Catholic

was a Catholic, regardless of heritage. Those were the people for whom the Vatican had standing with the Germans. It does not mean that these were the only people about whom the pope cared.

Immediately upon learning of the roundups, Pius filed protests through three channels. In the PBS interview, Kertzer gave a brief account of only one of them, Cardinal Secretary of State Maglione's meeting with German Ambassador Weizsäcker, in which he demanded that the Germans "stop these arrests at once."

It has long been known that Weizsäcker asked Maglione for permission not to report this conversation back to his German superiors, and the cardinal agreed. Kertzer leaves the impression that this means the Church was not seriously concerned about the arrestees. That is most unfair.

When Weizsäcker made the request, he had already told Maglione that he was "attempting to do something for the unfortunate Jews." Maglione thanked him for that and left the next step to Weizsäcker's judgment. A different response would not have assured a better result. Weizsäcker later explained, "Any protest by the Pope would only result in the deportations being really carried out in the thoroughgoing fashion. I know how our people react in these matters."

The new archives should shed light on this sad period of human history. Unfortunately, abbreviated accounts reported in news stories that are intended to sell books are more likely to produce heat. Fear not. The truth may take longer, but it will come out.

POLITICIZING SPORTS YIELDS NO WINNERS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on the decline of professional sports:

Were it not for the explosion of revenue coming from all the big TV screens, due to the multiplicity of cable sports channels, most owners of professional sports would be hurting. Fan attendance has been declining steadily, and even in terms of viewership, the NBA finals is drawing abysmal ratings. There are many reasons for this revolt, one of the most important of which is the increasing politicization of the game.

Recently, five Tampa Bay Rays players refused to wear the gay pride rainbow logo on their uniforms, citing religious objections to the gay lifestyle. They were immediately branded as “bigots” by ESPN-commentator Sarah Spain and many others.

Cyd Zeigler, writing for outsports.com, objected, saying, “Being gay is not a lifestyle.” Technically this is true, but what the players were objecting to was precisely the “lifestyle,” not the status of a person who happens to be gay. Besides, does he really believe that Pride Month is nothing more than a recognition of the mere existence of homosexuals?

David Hill at calltotheopen.com said that “Calling homosexuality a choice is a horrendous perspective.” Similarly, Sam Fels, writing for deadspin.com, said that to “talk about homosexuality as a ‘lifestyle,’ or ‘choice,’” means “you don’t get it.”

Both Hill and Fels are correct to acknowledge that Pride Month is really about homosexuality, not about being gay. Homosexuality is conduct, a behavior that Christians and others believe to be sinful, if not repulsive. They are

entitled to their belief. Moreover, they have a First Amendment right to exercise their freedom speech and their freedom of religion.

Tyler Kepner, writing in the New York Times, opines that "Words like 'lifestyle' and 'behavior' are widely known tropes often interpreted as a polite cover to condemning gay culture." He is to be commended for acknowledging the fact that a gay culture exists—that is what the baseball players were objecting to—but he is remiss in not telling us more about it. Larry Kramer, the gay guru, once called the gay lifestyle a "death style." That alone is worthy of discussion.

Kepner says that "the players should have been expected to reflect" the position of the team by wearing the special uniforms. AJ Gonzalez at enfuegonow.com agrees, arguing that allowing the players to "opt out of this choice is an ugly one." They should be careful what they wish for.

What would these writers say if Donald Trump bought a professional sports team and told his players they should wear a pro-life logo (perhaps a picture of a child *in utero*) on their uniform? Would they still be against allowing players to "opt out"?

One of the great things about sports, until recently, has been its ability to unite people. Fans may differ politically, but they come together to root for their hometown, or their country, when the game starts. This has been the greatest casualty of using TV time to flout one's ideological stripes (that conservative players do not act out tells us a great deal about the narcissistic nature of left-wing enthusiasts).

It began in 2016 when Colin Kaepernick said, "I'm not going to stand up to show pride in a flag for a country that oppresses black people and people of color." The irony of being a half-white multimillionaire, who and was raised by his white adoptive parents, was not lost on football fans. Worse, the

sight of filthy rich football players taking a knee during the national anthem only added to fan alienation.

Now we have Golden State Warriors coach Steve Kerr sounding off about guns and NASCAR officials celebrating what they call “the LGBTQ+ community.”

The time has come for the owners of professional sports to issue a joint statement saying that while players are free to express themselves on their own time, they are not permitted to do so once they put on their uniform. There would be an immediate pushback in some quarters, but once the dust settled, fans, players—and especially owners—would be relieved.

Fans go to the games to be entertained, not to be instructed on what to think. The politicization of sports yields no winners.

PELOSI HAS LONG CLASHED WITH THE BISHOPS

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on Rep. Nancy Pelosi’s history of clashing with the bishops:

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi’s recent run-in with San Francisco Archbishop Salvatore Cordileone is only the latest in a long line of clashes she has had with U.S. bishops. Her record of openly rejecting key moral teachings of the Catholic Church is extensive, calling into question her repeated assertions that she is a “devout Catholic.”

Here is a partial list of her departures from Church teachings

and her interactions with the various bishops.

- 1990: Rep. Pelosi took umbrage with New York Archbishop John Cardinal O'Connor for raising the possibility of excommunication for Catholic pro-abortion politicians. She replied, "it has to be clear that we are elected officials, and we uphold the law and, we support public positions separate and apart from our Catholic faith."
- 1995: The bishops objected to having Frances Kissling's pro-abortion and anti-Catholic group, Catholics for a Free Choice, at the U.N. Conference on Women in Beijing. The head of the bishops' conference, William Cardinal Keeler, said, "To use the name Catholic to promote the taking of innocent life is offensive." Pelosi worked hand-in-hand with Kissling. She defended her by saying, "Many women are concerned about freedom of speech and association at the conference. Accreditation should not be a politicized process."
- 2004: Pelosi defended her pro-abortion stance, saying, "I believe that my position on choice is one that is consistent with my Catholic upbringing, which said that every person has a free will and has the responsibility to live their own lives in a way that they would have to account for in the end." She lashed out at her Catholic critics, commenting, "I'm certainly concerned when the church comes together and says it's going to sanction people in public office for speaking their conscience and what they believe."
- 2004: Following her party's loss in the election, Pelosi said, "As a devout Catholic, I observe with great regret the intervention of some Catholic bishops who joined evangelical leaders in the political arena."
- 2005: San Francisco Archbishop William Levada said that Catholics, including Catholic politicians, must accept Church teaching about "the evil of abortion" if they want to remain "in full communion with the faith of the church." Pelosi publicly complained that she was being

“singled out” by the bishops for her defiance of Church teaching on abortion.

- 2006: Pelosi redefines “people of faith” as those who support the federal budget, not the life issues. She defended 114 protesters for blocking the entrance to the Capitol, saying, “They had events in the Capitol, they were arrested on the steps of the Cannon Building...” They were arrested because they broke the law.
- 2008: Pelosi was asked on “Meet the Press” to comment on when life begins. “I would say that as an ardent, practicing Catholic, this is an issue that I have studied for a long time. And what I know is, over the centuries, the doctors of the Church have not been able to make that definition.” Following the show, San Francisco Archbishop George Niederauer chided her for misrepresenting Church teaching and asked to see her. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) issued a news release correcting her. Pelosi struck back saying Saint Augustine took a different view. The USCCB answered her with a two-page document outlining the Catholic Church’s historical opposition to abortion since the first century. Cardinal George Pell responded by saying Augustine “believed that the embryo was ensouled at 46 days. Nevertheless, he also believed it was gravely wrong to kill a formed or unformed fetus.”
- 2009: Pelosi meets with Pope Benedict XVI and she quickly put a positive spin on it. In fact, she was rebuked by the pope. The Holy See Press Office commented as follows: “His Holiness took the opportunity to speak of the requirements of the natural moral law and the Church’s consistent teaching on the dignity of human life from conception to natural death which enjoin all Catholics, and especially legislators, jurists and those responsible for the common good of society, to work in co-operation with all men and women of good will in creating a just system of laws capable of protecting human life at all stages of its development.”

- 2014: Pelosi is awarded Planned Parenthood's highest honor, The Margaret Sanger Award, named after the notorious white racist.
- 2014: Pelosi is one of 48 Catholic Democrats who signed a letter criticizing the bishops for considering the withdrawal of Holy Communion from pro-abortion Catholic politicians. The dissidents said such a move would be "counterproductive and would bring great harm to the church."
- 2014: Pelosi publicly lectures San Francisco Archbishop Cordileone on his decision to speak at the March for Marriage, an event that supported marriage as the union between a man and a woman. He had never heretofore publicly criticized her, making plain that she started the public feud between the two of them.
- 2015: Pelosi received an award from the Gay and Lesbian Victory Fund, bringing her grandchildren to the gala. She falsely claimed that same-sex marriage is perfectly "consistent" with Church teachings.
- 2015: Pelosi attacked a Louisiana law requiring abortion doctors to have admitting privileges at a hospital within 30 miles of where the abortion is performed.
- 2015: Pelosi invoked Pope Francis in her remarks defending government funding of Planned Parenthood. A month earlier at the United Nations the pope called for "putting an end as quickly as possible" to such "baneful" practices as "the marketing of human organs and tissues." He called for "respect for the sacredness of every human life," including "the unborn."
- 2017: Pelosi seeks to restore the Obama administration's Health and Human Services mandate, which Trump rolled back. Thus did she seek again to force the Little Sisters of the Poor to pay for abortion-inducing drugs in their healthcare plans.
- 2020: Pelosi sought to discriminate against Catholic schools by denying them money awarded by the Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act. The

bishops spoke out against her effort. Yet she defended awarding funds to illegal aliens and sanctuary cities.

- 2020: Knoxville Bishop Rick Stika said, “It really confuses me that both Joe Biden and Nancy Pelosi time and time again state that they are faithful Catholics and yet promote unlimited abortion as well as deny so many of the teachings of our faith.”
- 2021: The USCCB urged Pelosi to withdraw her plan to force taxpayers to pay for abortions in Medicaid and other federal programs.
- 2021: San Francisco Archbishop Cordileone called on Catholics to join a prayer campaign seeking Pelosi’s “conversion to heart” on abortion rights.
- 2022: Archbishop Cordileone tells Pelosi not to present herself for Communion given her long-standing obstinacy defending abortion rights.
- 2022: Over a dozen bishops rush to support Archbishop Cordileone.
- 2022: Santa Rosa Bishop Robert Vasa, Arlington Bishop Michael Burbidge, Portland Archbishop Alexander Sample and Tyler, Texas Bishop Joseph Strickland announce that Pelosi is not welcome to receive Communion in their dioceses.
- 2022: Pelosi goes on TV to say that not only is Cordileone wrong, so are Church teachings on contraception, in vitro fertilization, gay and transgender issues and abortion.

There is no Catholic politician who has a record of openly defying the Catholic Church on the issues of women, marriage, the family and sexuality worse than House Speaker Nancy Pelosi. Worse, she defines herself as a “practicing, devout Catholic,” thus giving scandal to the Church by inviting Catholics and non-Catholics alike to believe that one can be a Catholic in good standing with the Church and at the same time reject core moral teachings.

There are atheists who are more in harmony with the Church's teachings on these issues than Pelosi is. She sought the confrontation—now she is paying for it.

REP. MALINOWSKI STIFFS PARENTS AGAIN

Catholic League president Bill Donohue comments on how a New Jersey congressman is treating parents in his district:

Rep. Tom Malinowski, a New Jersey Democrat, is back in the news for undermining parental rights once again. He is refusing to meet with parents who are livid about his defense of wholly inappropriate sexual instruction to young boys and girls.

During the COVID lockdown in 2020, parents across the nation learned what was really going on in their public schools. This hit home with many moms in New Jersey.

They learned, among other things, how some teachers and administrators were acting irresponsibly, offering classroom instruction on sexuality to young students that enticed them to consider whether they were satisfied with being a boy or a girl. If not, they were asked to consider whether switching to the opposite sex—which in reality is not possible—might be preferable. That they did this behind the back of parents underscored their deviant undertaking.

This did not sit well with Malinowski. He was not angry with school officials for violating basic ethical standards. No, he was angry at parents who objected to educators for bastardizing their role.

On March 15, I wrote Malinowski an [open letter](#) taking him to task for publicly berating concerned parents, portraying them as part of a “fringe group.” A video of his intemperance discussing the issue of parental involvement in education was made public.

These parents were not complaining about discussions of the birds and the bees. Instead, they were complaining about inviting young boys and girls to question their sex identity. They also registered objections over showing them graphic depictions of men having sex with men. That anyone would criticize parents for objecting to these pornographic exercises is incomprehensible, unless, of course, he were actively supporting the radical gay agenda.

Not surprisingly, Malinowski is a member of the Congressional LGBTQ+ Equality Caucus. He is totally committed to the most radical proposals espoused by activists representing this community. As such, he is working against parental oversight of their children’s education.

He received such pushback over his extremist stand that he agreed to meet with parents on April 19. The meeting never happened. After he cancelled it, he rescheduled it for May 21. He cancelled that one as well.

Apparently, this is not the first time Malinowski has had a problem with transparency. It was reported last year that he had “bought or sold as much as \$1 million of stock in medical and tech companies that had a stake in the virus [COVID] response.” He failed to disclose these trades as required by federal law.

The Associated Press noted that “The trades were just one slice of a stock buying and selling spree by the congressman at this time, worth as much as \$3.2 million, that he did not properly disclose.” Subsequently, two complaints were filed against him with the Office of Congressional Ethics.

Worse, Malinowski had earlier promoted himself as a beacon of ethics. In April 2020, when COVID fears were at a height, he boasted, "This is not the time for anybody to be profiting off of selling ventilators, vaccines, drugs, treatments, PPE (personal protective equipment), anywhere in the world."

Malinowski found himself in even deeper trouble when congressional ethics investigators found "substantial reason to believe" that he violated federal conflict-of-interest rules. He tried to worm his way out of this jam by saying he has "an overwhelmingly busy job." But he wasn't so busy that he didn't have time to flout the law by enriching himself off the pandemic.

It all fits like a glove. Malinowski has failed to be transparent with his unethical wheelings and dealings, and he has failed to be upfront with parents. Playing fast and loose with financial transactions is bad enough, but when mothers are verbally abused for protecting their children from sexual engineers, we have reached a new low, even for congressmen.

The mothers, fathers and children of New Jersey deserve straight answers to their pointed concerns. The time has come for Malinowski to address them with dispatch, without rancor or reprisal.